Expert Review Panel
Meeting Summary
February 11, 2005
Harbor Steps Conference Center

Panel Members Present: Darlene Cimino-DeRose, Alan Kiepper, William Lorenz, Steve Ludin, Mike Meyer, Thomas Schmitt, Siim Sööt; Alonzo Wertz; John Howell (Panel Administrator)

Speakers: Joni Earl (Sound Transit), Doug MacDonald (Washington Department of Transportation). Sound Transit Staff: Eric Chipps, Bob Harvey, Steve Kennedy, Paul Matsuoka, Perry Weinberg, John Perlic (Parametrix)

February 11

Mike Meyer, the Chair of the Panel, called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM. Panel members, staff and guests introduced themselves.

Introductory Remarks

Joni Earl, Chief Executive Officer of Sound Transit welcomed the Panel members. She noted that the voters gave Sound Transit an important charge in the 1996 vote—to handle the public's money wisely to form a regional transportation system. The Expert Review Panel, as independent experts, has an important role in ensuring that Sound Transit makes wise decisions in planning for the next phase of the system.

Doug MacDonald, Washington State Secretary of Transportation, also welcomed the Panel members. Now that Sound Transit's service is real and used by thousands of residents every day, the promise of a regional system of transit is being borne out. The prior expert panel, for the first phase of Sound Transit's system, played a very important part in the system's development. The Expert Review Panel was designed into the planning process by state law to ensure that the planning for the region's transit system stands on a firm foundation, and that the analysis is sound and credible.

Secretary MacDonald noted that this Panel's review also provides an opportunity to address some of the criticisms that have surfaced after the first expert panel concluded its work. The state Department of Transportation supports this new Expert Review Panel in asking critical and probing questions. The Panel needs to look critically at Sound Transit's analysis and methodologies.

A Panel member asked about the types of criticisms that have been raised. Aubrey Davis, who chaired the first panel, stated that the criticism arose after the first expert review panel's work had been completed, when people looked back at Sound Transit's planning. The criticism was around two areas. One was cost estimation in light of cost increases that took place as work progressed. The second area of criticism involved the rigorousness of the modal analysis, specifically on the assumptions for light rail and bus rapid transit. The criticism was that the analysis was biased in favor of rail.

Role of the Panel and Operating Ground Rules

—Mike Meyer

Role. The Expert Review Panel is mandated by the state legislature to ensure that Sound Transit's plans are well founded and can stand up to scrutiny in each professional discipline. The Panel's role is not to make recommendations to tell the agency what to do, but to report to the legislature, the Secretary of Transportation and the Governor's Office on the soundness of the plan. In short, the Panel's role is not to judge Sound Transit's decisions, but to determine whether the analysis that has gone into those decisions is correct.

Ground rules. Mr. Meyer reviewed the ground rules for the Panel's work. (See "Expert Review Panel Operating Ground Rules" in the meeting materials.) The goal is to have the Panel's work be as transparent as possible. All panel meetings will be open to the public. Written summaries of the Panel meetings and of conference calls of the whole Panel will be distributed to Panel members and posted on the Panel's Web site. All Panel members will receive copies of any correspondence with the Panel from Sound Transit or the public. For the Panel's written findings, Mr. Meyer suggested that each Panel member write the section dealing with his/her own area of expertise. All Panel members will then review and comment on the entire draft findings. Once final, the Panel's findings will be available to the public.

It is critically important to have a quorum (six of the eight Panel members) at Panel meetings. No alternates may attend in place of an appointed member. If it appears that a quorum will not be present for a meeting, that meeting will be rescheduled.

While the Panel will not take formal public testimony, Mr. Meyer may make time at the end of meetings to accept comments or questions from members of the public, as appropriate.

Mr. Meyer will serve as the Panel's spokesperson with the news media. John Howell is the point of contact. Panel members should pass on to Mr. Howell any requests for comment or materials.

Mr. Howell noted that the Panel's Web site, once it is in place, will be the Panel's primary way of providing information to the public.

Draft Work Plan and Schedule

—John Howell

The work plan covers December 2004 through November 2006. (See "Draft Work Plan and Schedule for Expert Review Panel" in the meeting materials.) It shows Sound Transit milestones as currently scheduled, that lead to a vote on the Sound Transit 2 plan, and the corresponding Panel quarterly meetings and tasks.

Next two months. February and March 2005 are important months for the development of the Long-Range Plan. Sound Transit staff will be producing a series of technical memos in preparation for the Sound Transit Board's April meeting, at which it will identify a preferred alternative for the Plan. In order to provide timely review, the Panel members individually will need to review the technical memos before the April Panel meeting, and that meeting must occur as early as possible in April. Sound Transit staff will be available in February and March to provide briefings for individual Panel members on the technical memos in each member's area

of expertise. In the April Panel meeting, members can discuss any issues that arise from these memos.

In response to a question about conference calls between meetings, Mr. Howell said that when the Panel meets as a quorum, whether in person or by phone, the meeting needs to be announced to the public. Written summaries of these phone calls will be prepared and posted on the Panel's Web site. However, briefings of one or two Panel members by Sound Transit staff are information gathering rather than decision making, so would not be announced or documented in written summaries.

The Panel members requested, as soon as possible, copies of any models, such as financial forecasting models, or methodology reports on which the technical memos will be based. The Panel can review these before getting the technical memos.

A Panel member requested information about Sound Transit's contacts with the operators of comparable systems—especially light rail and systems that have converted rail rights of way—summarizing what has been learned from their experience.

Next meeting. The Panel set the next meeting for Monday, April 4 and Tuesday, April 5. Darlene Cimino-DeRose said she will not be available for April 4 but could attend on the 5th. The other Panel members are available for both days. The Panel agreed to hold the meeting again at the Harbor Steps Conference Center in Seattle. Theresa Smith will check on availability.

Briefing on Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS)

—Steve Kennedy, Perry Weinberg, John Perlic. See "Supplemental EIS on the Regional Transit Long-Range Plan" in the meeting materials.

Note on terminology. In Sound Transit planning documents, "high-capacity transit" (HCT) includes all transit modes—bus and rail. "Generic rail" and "fixed guideway" includes light rail and monorail. "Bus rapid transit" (BRT) includes a number of options, including express buses on existing high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) lanes; the possibility of direct access ramps and bus-only ramps; and exclusive right-of-way busways.

Purposes. The SEIS lays the foundation for the rest of the planning for Sound Transit 2, including the assumptions, methodology and approach for investments. It is part of the environmental review process under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), but is broader than typical SEPA review. The SEIS is part of plan-level environmental review, which is done at the broad, programmatic level. This is in contrast to a review of specific project-level actions. Table 3-1 in the SEIS provides examples of the difference between the two types of review.

In addition, if there is a "federal nexus," such as a federal grant or permitting, then the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) comes into play. Sound Transit is working closely with the Federal Transit Agency (FTA). The FTA advised Sound Transit to complete the SEPA process before undertaking NEPA, since the state process includes some of the steps required for NEPA.

Alternatives and updates. The SEIS compares two alternatives: a Long-Range Plan alternative and a No-Action alternative. It builds on the 1993 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Regional Transit System Plan that preceded the vote creating Sound Transit. Table 3-7 of the SEIS shows how the SEIS updates the 1993 EIS. Key updates include:

- Extending the plan to 2030 to be consistent with Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) planning (the 1993 EIS went to 2020);
- Updating the ridership demand, travel times and traffic volume, based on the latest PSRC data;
- Making changes needed for new regulations; and
- Incorporating new environmental documentation that Sound Transit has done for specific projects.

The presentation listed the key results or benefits of the Long-Range Plan alternative, and the adverse impacts to the built and natural environments. (See page 5.)

In response to a question about planning coordination, Sound Transit staff said that PSRC incorporates Sound Transit's plans into its regional transportation plan.

In response to a question about the assumed mode of transit used for ridership forecasting and environmental assessment, Sound Transit staff said that in most corridors, transit was modeled as "generic rail" (high-capacity electric rail, whether light rail or monorail). However, where they have heard from the Sound Transit Board that other alternatives should be considered, they have included an analysis of bus rapid transit. For example, the State Route 99 corridor was modeled as bus rapid transit. The East King County corridor includes an analysis of HOV/BRT, busway/BRT, and fixed guideway. Sound Transit staff said that since rail tends to have greater environmental impacts than bus rapid transit, it made sense to consider rail in this programmatic EIS for every corridor where it is an option.

Public comment on SEIS. Sound Transit put out the Draft SEIS for public comment. Comments were due on January 31, 2005. Approximately 200 comments came in. Sound Transit staff are still evaluating the comments. In general, the comments were as follows:

- Agencies (e.g., PSRC, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, State Historic Preservation Office) generally endorsed the methodology used. PSRC, which is now updating its regional plan and transportation plan, encouraged continued coordination.
- Jurisdictions offered wish lists and comments on specific projects.
- The public and citizens' organizations provided quite a few comments, including significant support for considering a variety of mode choices and technologies.

The Panel requested a more detailed description of public comments, and copies of any letters or comments about methodologies or approaches. Sound Transit said a high-level summary of public comments will be available in two weeks. ST staff will work with John Howell to identify comments about methodologies or approaches, and will send copies to the Panel.

Next steps. Sound Transit will prepare detail responses to the comments and will revise the SEIS. The agency expects to issue the final SEIS in late May for adoption by the Board.

Questions from the Panel

SEIS Analysis

Q. What are the most important changes from the 1993 EIS?
A. The land use and transportation analysis was updated and extended another 10 years to 2030. Also, the SEIS includes an analysis of land use trends and changes in regulations since 1993.

Q. Is there anything in the 1993 EIS that has very different assumptions than the SEIS?
A. The major change is the transit forecast and effects on the transportation system. There were no changes in how transportation is modeled—what in 1993 were thought to be the high-volume, high growth corridors are the same today.

Q. Where are the impacts of construction considered (as an adverse impact) in the EIS process?
A. This occurs in the project-level environmental document, which will be prepared after the vote on Sound Transit 2.

Q. How does the SEIS support the decision process?
A. The technical analyses are being done at the same time as the SEIS. The SEIS informs the Board on choices in general. It's part of a funneling down process to reach decisions. The SEIS provides the broad programmatic review and the technical memos provide more detail about mode choices and other decisions in specific corridors.

Coordination with Other Agencies

Q. Is there a hierarchy of transit agencies?
A. Sound Transit is the designated regional carrier charged with developing high-capacity systems. In the Sound Transit district there are four bus companies. Sound Transit contracts with three (Community Transit, King County Metro and Pierce Transit) to run local service. By statute at least half of the Sound Transit Board also sits on the boards of local transportation agencies.

Q. There is a policy-level forum for addressing transportation issues. Is there also a staff-level forum to address the details of planning?
A. Yes, the Transit Integration Group, a group of planners from different agencies, works on system integration and such matters as future fare increases. Sound Transit staff regularly coordinates with staff of other transportation agencies. There is also a regular meeting of transit general managers, which includes Seattle Monorail.

Q. Seattle Monorail was created after Sound Transit, so there's no common membership of Monorail and Sound Transit boards as there is with bus companies. Is there potential for overlap, such as in service to Northgate?
A. In theory there could be parallel systems, but it is unlikely that the voters would approve duplicate systems.

Mode Choices

Q. Does the analysis in the SEIS preclude opting for a bus mode over rail?
A. The SEIS looks at a variety of alternatives to extend the work done in Phase I.

Q. In the major corridors, at the plan level, are there any mode choices that are being excluded?
A. The Board asked Sound Transit staff to examine monorail and BRT technologies where there has been no start on light rail, such as in East King County and the 522 corridor. In the I-5 north/south corridor, the question is how to expand the existing light rail line, and how rail and bus work best together. For example, Sound Transit is planning a light rail system that gets part of the way to Everett and bus rapid transit for service connections for the remainder of Snohomish County. The agency would implement both rail and bus rapid transit.

Q. Seattle Monorail's long-range plan envisions extending the monorail on State Route 99. What is Sound Transit looking at for this corridor?
A. Sound Transit is looking at the SR 99 corridor as bus rapid transit. It crosses county lines where different bus companies provide service. On the previous day's bus tour, Monorail officials said they would like to see monorail options explored on SR 99.

Q. Does the plan exclude bus as a mode in the analysis just because it wasn't included in the prior phase? Are the costs of all modes considered and treated fairly?
A. No mode is being excluded for the east-west corridor. Several new bus rapid transit lines are being considered for the north corridor. However, new modes are not being explored where the light rail is under construction, in the I-5 corridor. Rather, the issue is how rail and bus service work together as the system evolves over time.

Q. When connecting Central Link light rail to the airport, and the airport to Tacoma Link light rail, would you consider bus rapid transit?
A. Yes, Sound Transit already has express bus service to Tacoma and would look at that as a means of connecting with the airport. But, as the rail system is extended, the question arises of how rail and bus services work together as the system evolves in response to demand.

Q. SEPA analysis looks at broad corridors but doesn't yield the kind of findings that help in making mode choices. When the Board adopts the Sound Transit 2 Plan, the NEPA process will begin. That will include a hard look at all alternatives to achieve the goals within each corridor.
A. Yes. However, it is anticipated that the Board will make preliminary decisions about mode choices as part of the long-range plan. One of the notable omissions in the environmental process is capital costs, which are important to decisions on mode. Order of magnitude cost estimates will be made during the Long-Range Plan process. More detailed, but still conceptual, capital cost estimates will be included in the Sound Transit 2 plan.

Q. Doesn't the East King County corridor study include a preferred mode choice to be adopted by the Board? Will the Board make a fundamental policy choice in June?
A. What we're doing now is an alternatives analysis. The Board will be asked to make a decision about preferred mode choice in June. NEPA won't reopen all the alternatives, though there is a potential to revisit some of the alternatives.

Q. Is *not* extending the light rail an option?
A. No, the assumption is the long-range plan has a rail connection. Sound Transit is looking at how bus will connect with this.

Comments from the Public

Aubrey Davis noted that the prior Expert Review Panel asked Sound Transit to look at exclusive busways, and these were considered in terms of the cost and the tunnels needed.

Will Knedlik cited a speech given by Professor Scott Rutherford on January 10, 2003, at Portland State University. Mr. Knedlik stated that Professor Rutherford talked about his experience on the prior Expert Review Panel, and said that because Sound Transit knew what they wanted, the alternatives analysis was weak. Mr. Knedlik will send the Web site link for this speech to John Howell for the Panel's information.

Briefing on Ridership Forecasting Model

—Bob Harvey and Eric Chipps (Sound Transit). See "Transit Forecasting Analysis Procedures" presentation in the meeting materials.

Incremental model. The presentation reviewed the history of ridership modeling for transit in the region from 1986 to the present (slide 3). The last comprehensive, transit origin-and-destination survey in the three counties was done in 1993. It has been updated periodically. The presentation included the rationale for using an incremental model (slide 4). An incremental model estimates transit at a point in time, then allows for adjustments up and down based on specific data. A synthetic model, on the other hand, recreates a sample weekday of transportation, including detail for a wide range of factors. Synthetic models are used more often for auto travel forecasting. Sound Transit is using an incremental model because it is simple, transit-specific, based on observed transit travel patterns, accepted by the Federal Transit Administration, and closely interfaces with the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) regional model.

For transit patterns, Sound Transit uses passenger data from the bus companies, and PSRC's estimates of future total travel.

Comparison of models. The presentation compared Sound Transit's model to the PSRC model (slide 6). Where the models differ, they are compatible. Sound Transit uses the PSRC model for zonal parking and economic factors. PSRC does a parking cost survey every three years.

The Panel asked if the Puget Sound Regional Council model and parameters have received expert review of the assumptions and coefficients, or if PSRC has done sensitivity analyses on its parking cost model. Staff will follow up.

Forecasting. The presentation reviewed the stages of transit ridership forecasting (slides 7-9). The need to transfer is included where known. Park and Ride is currently 13 to 15 percent of all trips in the region. For the forecasting, in-vehicle time coefficients and waiting times are multiplied by an average dollar rate per hour to get the implied value of travel time (slides 10-12). This yields an elasticity measure—the larger the coefficient, the less likely a resident is to take transit. Sound Transit did not calibrate these measures but used PSRC guidelines, tested by backcasting.

The Panel asked staff to provide information about the comparison of wait time for transfers (in transit trips) with in-vehicle wait times. Also, the Panel would like more information on current trends in auto use.

Fare increases. In the December conference call, members of the Panel requested information about the change in transit fares compared to the rate of inflation. Sound Transit staff found that fares have kept up with inflation, and in some cases have exceeded inflation slightly (slide 13). Two factors influencing fare increases were increases in labor costs, and the decreased income resulting from a citizen initiative in the late 1990s that repealed the auto excise tax, which had provided some funding for transit.

Growth in population, employment and ridership. The presentation compared growth in these factors. Since 1980, transit ridership in King County has grown slightly more than employment and population.

Siim Sööt noted that nationwide, employment grew more rapidly than did population in the 1980s and '90s. But recently there has been less difference between the two growth rates. A recent Sound Transit report shows that 56 percent of the population is in the labor force. Dr. Sööt stated that this is a larger percentage than in many metro areas.

PSRC forecasts employment and population in the region. In response to a question about how well the forecasting model has worked, Sound Transit staff said that the forecasts in the 1970s and '80s overallocated employment in South Seattle for Boeing, and underallocated employment for the airport and East Side locations such as Microsoft's campus. However, the forecasts were correct for downtown Seattle and the University District.

In the SEIS, population and employment assumptions are based on PSRC forecasts, and are the same for every mode choice. These do not take into account changes that might be spurred by the availability of transit lines.

The presentation discussed Sound Transit model validation (slides 15-17). The model does well for transit times, but not as well for daily boardings. The presentation concluded with discussion of the limitation of incremental methods and areas of possible refinement (slides 18-19).

The presenters asked for the Panel's comments on:

- Use of synthetic versus incremental (transit only) models;
- Use of the new trip distribution results;
- Parking cost estimates, especially in comparison to how other regions forecast these costs; and
- Bus speeds, which tend to deteriorate over time, and the methodology for forecasting transit speeds.

Questions from the Panel

Q. What is the basis for forecasts of expansion of capacity in the highway network?
A. It is in terms of carrying capacity, not lane miles.

Q. Projections show HOV lanes becoming more congested. Does the model take into account possible policy changes, such as fees for HOV use?
A. The model does not have the ability to address this kind of change.

Q. When considering access to transit stations, how is future congestion in the area taken into account?
A. The model is for the big picture, it can't be used for this kind of specific analysis.

The Panel would like to have more information from the Puget Sound Regional Council about their assumptions and data behind employment and population numbers, spatial distribution, and travel times. Also find out if the Federal Transit Administration reviewed and approved in writing the PSRC models.

System Alternatives for East King County

—Paul Matsuoka (Sound Transit). See "East King County High Capacity Transit Analysis: Approach to Assessing System-Level Scenarios" presentation, and "Eastside mass transit technology analysis" sheet.

Studies. East King County is the next corridor for expansion of Sound Transit services, based on an analysis of transportation corridors by the Puget Sound Regional Council. Studies of development density and ridership show that the most likely use of transit is in the central part of the area, including Bellevue, Redmond, Kirkland and Issaquah.

In the 1996 Long-Range Plan, State Route 520 was designated for bus service because there was no discussion at that time of widening the 520 bridge. Since 1996, there have been several corridor studies:

- I-405 Corridor Study, cosponsored by Washington Department of Transportation and Sound Transit, identified bus rapid transit as the preferred alternative.
- Trans-Lake Study (State Route 520), cosponsored by Washington Department of Transportation and Sound Transit, concluded that Interstate 90 is a better choice for cross-lake, high-capacity transit, but recommended keeping the high-capacity transit option open for 520.
- I-90 Study resulted in a preferred alternative (called R-8A) of using HOV lanes on outer roadways. There is a federal record of decision for this alternative. There would be an eight-foot shoulder on one side of the bridge, with a two- to four-foot width on the other side. These dimensions meet industry standards.

Four alternatives. Sound Transit is conducting a system-level analysis of four alternatives. These are being analyzed as "pure" scenarios (the same option used in every corridor), although in the end there will likely be a combination of options. A major question is the mode choice on the Interstate 90 floating bridge.

- ***Baseline:*** No transit other than what has been developed in Phase 1.
- ***Use of HOV lanes with bus rapid transit (HOV/BRT):*** There will likely be more use of this mode in Sound Transit 2 than in Phase 1. On I-90, the HOV are two-way reversible lanes. The alternative includes special ramps to allow buses to get into the HOV lanes

and transit centers. The challenge with this alternative is that as traffic becomes heavier in the general purpose lanes, the HOV lanes will slow down, too.

- ***Busway with bus rapid transit (Busway/BRT):*** I-90 would have a busway in the center from Seattle east to Overlake. On I-405, Sound Transit would use the center of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe right-of-way for an exclusive busway that would end on the north in Totem Lake.
- ***Fixed guideway:*** The guideway could be used for light rail, monorail, or BRT that could be converted to rail later. The route would run across the I-90 bridge to just beyond Issaquah on the southeast, to Redmond on the east and Totem Lake on the north. For light rail and BRT through downtown Bellevue, the alternative assumes a tunnel; monorail does not. The alternative includes platform-to-platform transfers for monorail. A significant question is whether the weight of monorail is feasible on the I-90 bridge.

Slides 11 and 12 in the presentation show the evaluation criteria for alternatives analysis, and the next steps. The analysis is scheduled to be final in March and presented to the Sound Transit Board in April.

Questions from the Panel

Rail Alternatives

Q. There seems to be a belief that the I-90 bridge can support the weight of light rail. What analysis is being done on this question?
A. Prior engineering studies have concluded light rail is feasible; no current analysis is underway.

Q. Rail could be costly because of the dynamic load for fixed rail on a floating bridge. Is this going to be studied before making decisions based on cost?
A. Sound Transit is making order-of-magnitude cost estimates in the SEIS process. The more detailed cost estimates will be included in Sound Transit 2 planning.

Q. Has welded rail ever been put on a floating bridge?
A. Not that Sound Transit knows of, although the I-90 bridge was designed to accommodate rail. The state Department of Transportation has done a study of how light rail on I-90 could accommodate the movement of the bridge, and came up with a proposed solution. The study examined the range of movement on the bridge and compared it to other bridges that carry rail, such as extension bridges.

The Panel would like to see a copy of the Department of Transportation study on light rail on the I-90 bridge.

Q. Are there any challenges with the alignment in Bellevue for the Burlington Northern right-of-way on the east side of 405?
A. There is a trestle that would need to be replaced.

Q. How would conversion work for the rail-convertible to BRT option?
A. The buses would need to be moved off of the right of way to build the conversion.

Analysis

Q. Environmental justice is not on the list of evaluation criteria.
A. It should be included; it wasn't consciously left out.

Q. Will there be analysis of mixed alternatives as well as the pure alternatives?
A. At this point, the focus is on the pure analyses so people can assess the match of modes and corridors. Sound Transit expects to re-run analyses using hybrid systems as requested.

Q. What are the assumptions about land use?
A. Land use is constant in all alternatives. The terminal locations take advantage of existing systems.

Q. One criterion is ridership. But ridership forecasting for the SEIS won't differentiate between light rail and monorail. How will this be handled?
A. The monorail terminal would be in south downtown with transfers to other transit services, such as buses on 4th Ave. S. and light rail in the downtown Seattle transit tunnel. Light rail would continue through the transit tunnel and on to points north, such as the University District and Northgate.

Airport Connections

Q. What is the status of the connection for light rail to the airport?
A. Sound Transit has reached agreement with the Port of Seattle (the agency that operates the airport) and the City of Sea Tac on the right-of-way design and environmental assessment, and will complete the design work and assessment approximately mid-year. The construction and alignment is funded. The expected service date is December 2009.

Q. Is it possible to avoid the 1,000 foot walk into the airport terminal?
A. No, the station location has been set by the Port. There will be a walkway on the northeast corner of the parking garage to enter the terminal. The walkway will be for exclusive use of light rail passengers.

At the next meeting the Panel would like to receive an update on the plans for the walkway from the light rail station to the airport terminal.

Next Steps for the Review Panel

Next meeting. The Panel set the next meeting for April 4 and 5. The anticipated agenda will include:

- Cost estimation methodology
- Analysis of financial capacity by subarea
- Capital costs (operations and maintenance costs won't be ready yet)
- Possibly – evaluation criteria
- Possibly – modeling, scope for the East King County corridor
- Ask a staff person from Link light rail to attend the meeting

David Beal suggested that if the Panel wants to issue comments on the Draft SEIS, the sooner these can the done, the better.

Technical memos to review before the April meeting. The following technical memos (from the list of memos being prepared in February and March) were identified by Sound Transit and Panel members as especially important for Panel review:

- Converting BRT to LRT
- Potential Pierce County Sounder Extension
- Tacoma Link/Central Link Integration
- LRT Extension to Burien
- SR-522 Corridor HCT Assessment
- East King County Subarea HCT Analysis
- I-5 Corridor North HCT Review/assessment
- Cost estimating reports
- Evaluation methodology

Additional information requests from the Panel:

- Summary of cost experience that compares the original estimates for projects with the actual costs, where available
- Change order history
- Studies on the cost of property acquisition
- Materials used for Sound Transit's presentation at the time of the last bond sale
- Sound Transit's existing financial policies and any changes under consideration
- Sound Transit organization chart (at a broad level)

Mr. Howell will create a brief written summary of the information the Panel has requested at this meeting and questions for Sound Transit staff. He will send this to Panel members for additions and corrections before sending it to Sound Transit.

Public comment. None.

The meting adjourned at 4:05 PM.

F:\Sound Transit Expert Review Panel\Panel Meetings\February 10 & 11 2005\Summary Notes 2-11 Meeting Finalcorrected.doc